

REMARKS

Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,263,824 to Jones et al. (“the Jones patent”). Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,986,643 to Harvill et al. (“the Harvill patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,302,138 to Zarudiansky (“the Zarudiansky patent”). Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Harvill patent in view of the Jones patent. The rejections of claim 59 are rendered moot by the cancellation of the claim. Claims 60-76 are pending in the application, with claims 60 and 73 being the independent claims.

Claim 60 recites in pertinent part: “a haptic feedback member coupled to and spaced apart from the support member.” Independent claim 73 contains a similar recitation. The Jones patent discloses a haptic feedback device that uses a single pneumatic bladder to apply a haptic feedback force to the user (column 3, lines 29-44). The Jones patent fails to teach or suggest “a haptic feedback member coupled to and spaced apart from the support member” as recited in new claim 60. The bladder disclosed in the Jones patent is located within the palm of a glove worn by the user. This bladder is embedded within the support member, rather than being “spaced apart” from it, as recited in independent claim 60. The Jones patent further fails to

teach or suggest a method including “determining the magnitude of haptic feedback output at the haptic feedback application interface,” as recited in independent claim 73.

The Harvill patent discloses a haptic feedback device that includes a number of haptic feedback members that may include memory metals, a solenoid, a piezoceramic bender or other such vibrating devices. The Harvill patent fails to disclose or suggest the claimed “second sensor configured to output an applied force signal based on the haptic feedback output,” as recited in independent claim 60. Moreover, the Harvill patent fails to disclose or suggest a method including “determining the magnitude of haptic feedback output at the haptic feedback application interface,” as recited in independent claim 73.

The Zarudiansky patent discloses a haptic feedback interface for interaction with an “artificial” or “slave” hand. The slave hand includes a number of sensors for determining parameters such as pressure, force, and temperature (column 2, lines 16-23). The Zarudiansky patent fails to disclose or suggest the claimed “second sensor configured to output an applied force signal based on the haptic feedback output,” as recited in claim 60. Moreover, the Zarudiansky patent fails to disclose or suggest a method including “determining the magnitude of haptic feedback output at the haptic feedback application interface,” as recited in claim 73.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 60 and 73 are allowable over the cited references, either alone or in combination. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 60 and 73, dependent claims 61-72 and 73-76 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner

believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.


Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: May 27, 2003

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656
Tel: (703) 456-8000
Fax: (703) 456-8100

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887